

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are pending. Applicants have canceled Claims 1-5 and 7-10 to expedite prosecution in the instant application. Applicants may proceed with prosecution of these canceled claims in a continuing application. Claim 6 is pending and amended. Support for the amendments to the claim can be found throughout the Specification, in particular, on page 27, line 1 to page 28, line 2, page 58, lines 15-29, and originally filed Claim 1. No new matter is added.

Rejection of Claims 1-3 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beck *et al.* (Acta Neurologica Scandinavica, 1988 Oct, Vol. 78, pp. 318-323) in view of the abstract of Beck *et al.* (Immunobiology, 1987, Vol. 175, pp. 91-92) and the abstract of Selmaj *et al.* (Neuroimmunology, 1987, Vol. 16, page 159) is maintained for reasons of record. Claim 10 is also rejected for the same reasons of record as many murine anti-TNF antibodies are produced by hybridoma technology.

Applicants have canceled Claims 1-3 and 10, thus rendering the rejection moot.

Rejection of Claims 1-3, 4, 7, 8 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-3, 4, 7, 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beck *et al.* (Acta Neurologica Scandinavica, 1988 Oct, Vol. 78, pp. 318-323), the abstract of Beck *et al.* (Immunobiology, 1987, Vol. 175, pp. 91-92) and the abstract of Selmaj *et al.* (Neuroimmunology, 1987, Vol. 16, page 159) as applied to Claims 1-3 above, and further in view of Moller *et al.* (Cytokine 1990, Vol. 2, pp. 162-169, cited in a related application).

Applicants have canceled Claims 1-4, 7, 8, and 10, thus rendering the rejection moot.

Rejection of Claims 1-5 and 7-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-5 and 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beck *et al.* (Acta Neurologica Scandinavica, 1988 Oct, Vol. 78, pp. 318-323), the abstract of Beck *et al.* (Immunobiology, 1987, Vol. 175, pp. 91-92) the abstract of Selmaj *et al.* (Neuroimmunology, 1987, Vol. 16, page 159) and of Moller *et al.* (Cytokine 1990, Vol. 2, pp.

162-169, cited in a related application) as applied to Claims 1-3, 4, 7, 8 and 10 above, and further in view of Zerler (EP 380,068, cited in a related application).

Applicants have cancelled Claims 1-5, and 7-10, thus rendering the rejection moot.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants note Claim 6 was deemed allowable by the Examiner if rewritten in independent format (page 8 of Office Action). Applicants have amended Claim 6 to incorporate the subject matter of Claim 5 and Claim 1. In view of this amendment, the remaining claim, Claim 6, is allowable and the case should be passed to issuance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that Claim 6 is in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By Pamela A. Torpey
Pamela A. Torpey
Registration No. 45,736
Telephone: (978) 341-0036
Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Dated:

January 14, 2005